Office Action Summary	**Application No.**	**Applicant(s)**	
	10/686,008	WEDDELING ET AL.	
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11 June 2009_.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.
  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _5/29/2009_ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A. This action is in response to the following communications: Amendment filed: 06/11/2009. This action is made **Final**.

B. Claims 1-20 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. **Claims 1-10, 14-15 and 18-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Petty, Douglas Robert et al (US 6,342,907 B1)**, herein

referred to as “Petty” in view of **Jung, Jae Ho (US Pub 2002/0091709 A1)**, herein referred to as “Jung”.

As for independent claim 1, Petty teaches a method of converting a computer user interface panel between different panel types, the method comprising: identifying a first panel associated with a first computer system configured for displaying panels of a first type and not web-based panels (windows resource script type panels (col.7, lines 38-49); activating an automated process that reads field attributes in a first configuration table (1310; wherein 1310 depicts a structured document containing specific information for reproducing a panel; a table in comparison to 1310 yields the same predictable result of an organized data structure containing key information to the systems use) that can be used to display the first panel in the first computer system, the first panel comprising a plurality of fields and belonging to the first type of panels in which a configuration table associated with a panel of the first type is tied to logic that specifies how the panel of the first type interacts with a backend of the first computer system (col.7, lines 24-49); and creating entries in a second configuration table (1320 and 1330) that can be used to display a second panel in a second computer system configured for displaying panels of a second type that is web based (PDML, col.7, lines 24-49; java), the second panel comprising at least some of the plurality of fields and belonging to the second type of panels in which a panel of the second type is formed of configuration table entries and is independent of a backend of the second computer system; displaying the second panel to a user of the second computer system wherein the automated process converts the field attributes to be compatible with the second type of panels and stores them in the second configuration table for use by the second computer system in displaying the second panel (col.21, lines 20-38).

Petty further teaches that each field in a resource script file is converted into XML tags to be read by PDML language (col.21, line 20 - col.22, line 31).

Petty does not specifically in great detail teach detects a pattern among the field attributes in the first configuration table, the detected pattern comprising a first field attribute corresponding to an input field that is located on a common row and next to a non-input field corresponding to a second field attribute, wherein the detected corresponds to a format for providing input to the input field, converts the field attributes to be compatible with the second type of panels in a manner such that the detected pattern between the first field attribute and the second field attribute is preserved when the second panel is displayed to the user by the second computer system, and stores the converted field attributes in the second configuration table for use by the second computer system in displaying the second panel.

However in the same field of endeavor Jung teaches *detects a pattern among the field attributes in the first configuration table, the detected pattern comprising a first field attribute corresponding to an input field that is located on a common row and next to a non-input field corresponding to a second field attribute, wherein the detected corresponds to a format for providing input to the input field, converts the field attributes* *to be compatible with the second type of panels in a manner such that the detected pattern between the first field attribute and the second field attribute is preserved when the second panel is displayed to the user by the second computer system, and stores the converted field attributes in the second configuration table for use by the second computer system in displaying the second panel* (figures 4 and 6-8; par.33, 35-36, 38-39 and 42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Jung into Petty, this is true because Jung solves the problem of providing a user interface directed towards the conversion of data in a first type for a first panel (first application) into data of a second type for a second panel (second application) (Par.15). Petty solves a similar problem, providing a user interface directed towards the conversion of data in a first type (platform-specific user interface panels) into of a second type (platform-independent user interface panels). Thus it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to see the variant option of Jung to be a modification for Petty by providing additional functionality to solve a similar problem.

As for dependent claim 2, Petty teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising associating the field attributes with fields of the second panel (col.21, lines 20-38).

As for dependent claim 3, Petty teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the field attributes that are read in the first configuration table are those field attributes of the first panel that are relevant for converting the first panel to the second panel (col.21, lines

20-38; first file is needed to output desired file).

As for dependent claim 4, Petty teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the plurality of fields comprises first and second template fields to be displayed next to each other on a common row in the first panel, wherein converting attributes associated with the first and second template fields comprises determining whether the second template field is an input field (col.10, line 49; PDML Tags- listed through columns 14-20 are various graphical user interface elements known as PDML Tags which make up the panel in the graphical user interface which is converted using the conversion tool).

As for dependent claim 5, Petty teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the second template field is not an input field, further comprising converting the attributes associated with the first and second template fields so that the first and second template fields will be displayed on a common row of the second panel (note the analysis of claim 4 above; mapping is handled by the conversion tool).

As for dependent claim 6, Petty teaches the method of claim 1.
Petty further teaches that each field in a resource script file is converted into XML tags to be read by PDML language (col.21, line 20 - col.22, line 31).
Petty does not specifically in great detail teach wherein the detected pattern comprises a date field with blank characters representing numbers that make up a date and backslash characters separating numbers.

However in the same field of endeavor Jung teaches *wherein the detected pattern comprises a date field with blank characters representing numbers that make up a date and backslash characters separating numbers* (figures 4 and 6-8; par.33, 35-36, 38-39 and 42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Jung into Petty, this is true because Jung solves the problem of providing a user interface directed towards the conversion of data in a first type for a first panel (first application) into data of a second type for a second panel (second application) (Par.15). Petty solves a similar problem, providing a user interface directed towards the conversion of data in a first type (platform-specific user interface panels) into of a second type (platform-independent user interface panels). Thus it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to see the variant option of Jung to be a modification for Petty by providing additional functionality to solve a similar problem.

As for dependent claim 7, Petty teaches the method of claim 1.

Petty further teaches that each field in a resource script file is converted into XML tags to be read by PDML language (col.21, line 20 - col.22, line 31).

Petty does not specifically in great detail teach wherein the detected pattern comprises a time field with blank characters representing numbers that make up a time and colon characters separating the numbers.

However in the same field of endeavor Jung teaches *wherein the detected pattern comprises a time field with blank characters representing numbers that make up a time* *and colon characters separating the numbers* (figures 4 and 6-8; par.33, 35-36, 38-39 and 42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Jung into Petty, this is true because Jung solves the problem of providing a user interface directed towards the conversion of data in a first type for a first panel (first application) into data of a second type for a second panel (second application) (Par.15). Petty solves a similar problem, providing a user interface directed towards the conversion of data in a first type (platform-specific user interface panels) into of a second type (platform-independent user interface panels). Thus it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to see the variant option of Jung to be a modification for Petty by providing additional functionality to solve a similar problem.

As for dependent claim 8, Petty teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the panels of the second type comprise columns in which the fields are arranged and wherein each of the plurality of fields has a length specified as a number of characters, wherein converting the field attributes comprises assigning a specific width of at least one column to each of the fields based on its specified length (note the analysis of claim 4 above).

As for dependent claim 9, Petty teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first panel comprises a plurality of binary controls that can be individually selected by a user, and wherein panels of the first type having such binary controls comprise a Boolean variable for each of the binary controls, wherein attributes associated with the binary controls are converted so that one of the fields of the second panel represents the binary controls (col.3, lines 30-33; user does not need to known program specific language).

As for dependent claim 10, Petty teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving and executing a user input for editing the second pane (col.3, lines 25-33).

As for independent claim 14, Petty teaches a computer system for converting a user interface panel between different panel types, the system comprising: *a first configuration table for use by a first computer system to display a first panel comprising a plurality of fields and belonging to a first type of panels that is not web-based and in which a configuration table associated with a panel of the first type is tied to logic that specifies how the panel of the first type interacts with a backend of the first computer system, a plurality of field attributes being associated with the plurality of fields, the first computer system being configured for displaying panels of the first type and not web-based panels; a second configuration table for use by a second computer system to display a second panel comprising at least some of the plurality of fields and belonging to a second type of panels that is web-based and in which a panel of the second type is formed of configuration table entries and is independent of a backend of the second computer system; and a conversion module that converts at least some of the field attributes to be compatible with the second type of panels and stores them in the second configuration table for use by the second computer system in displaying the* *second panel*. (Note the analysis of claim 1, along with col.7, lines 23-37; figures 1 and 13).

Petty further teaches that each field in a resource script file is converted into XML tags to be read by PDML language (col.21, line 20 - col.22, line 31).

Petty does not specifically in great detail teach detects a pattern among the field attributes in the first configuration table, the detected pattern comprising a first field attribute corresponding to an input field that is located on a common row and next to a non-input field corresponding to a second field attribute, wherein the detected corresponds to a format for providing input to the input field, converts the field attributes to be compatible with the second type of panels in a manner such that the detected pattern between the first field attribute and the second field attribute is preserved when the second panel is displayed to the user by the second computer system, and stores the converted field attributes in the second configuration table for use by the second computer system in displaying the second panel.

However in the same field of endeavor Jung teaches *detects a pattern among the field attributes in the first configuration table, the detected pattern comprising a first field attribute corresponding to an input field that is located on a common row and next to a non-input field corresponding to a second field attribute, wherein the detected corresponds to a format for providing input to the input field, converts the field attributes to be compatible with the second type of panels in a manner such that the detected pattern between the first field attribute and the second field attribute is preserved when the second panel is displayed to the user by the second computer system, and stores* *the converted field attributes in the second configuration table for use by the second computer system in displaying the second panel* (figures 4 and 6-8; par.33, 35-36, 38-39 and 42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Jung into Petty, this is true because Jung solves the problem of providing a user interface directed towards the conversion of data in a first type for a first panel (first application) into data of a second type for a second panel (second application) (Par.15). Petty solves a similar problem, providing a user interface directed towards the conversion of data in a first type (platform-specific user interface panels) into of a second type (platform-independent user interface panels). Thus it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to see the variant option of Jung to be a modification for Petty by providing additional functionality to solve a similar problem.

As for dependent claim 15, Petty teaches the computer system of claim 14, wherein the conversion module is capable of receiving and executing a command for editing the second panel (col.3, lines 25-33).

As for independent claim 18, Petty teaches a computer program product tangibly embodied in a computer-readable storage device, the computer program product containing executable instructions that when executed cause a processor to perform operations comprising: identifying a first panel associated with a first computer system configured for displaying panels of a first type and not web-based panels; *activating an* *automated process that reads field attributes in a first configuration table that can be used to display the first panel in the first computer system, the first panel comprising a plurality of fields and belonging to the first type of panels that is not web-based and in which a configuration table associated with a panel of the first type is tied to logic that specifies how the panel of the first type interacts with a backend of the first computer system; and creating entries in a second configuration table that can be used to display a second panel in a second computer system configured for displaying panels of a second type that is web-based, the second panel comprising at least some of the plurality of fields and belonging to the second type of panels in which a panel of the second type is formed of configuration table entries and is independent of a backend of the second computer system; wherein the automated process converts the field attributes to be compatible with the second type of panels and stores them in the second configuration table for use by the second computer system in displaying the second panel*. (Note the analysis of claim 1, along with col.7, lines 23-37; col.8, lines 35-59; figures 1 and 13).

Petty further teaches that each field in a resource script file is converted into XML tags to be read by PDML language (col.21, line 20 - col.22, line 31).

Petty does not specifically in great detail teach detects a pattern among the field attributes in the first configuration table, the detected pattern comprising a first field attribute corresponding to an input field that is located on a common row and next to a non-input field corresponding to a second field attribute, wherein the detected corresponds to a format for providing input to the input field, converts the field attributes to be compatible with the second type of panels in a manner such that the detected pattern between the first field attribute and the second field attribute is preserved when the second panel is displayed to the user by the second computer system, and stores the converted field attributes in the second configuration table for use by the second computer system in displaying the second panel.

However in the same field of endeavor Jung teaches *detects a pattern among the field attributes in the first configuration table, the detected pattern comprising a first field attribute corresponding to an input field that is located on a common row and next to a non-input field corresponding to a second field attribute, wherein the detected corresponds to a format for providing input to the input field, converts the field attributes to be compatible with the second type of panels in a manner such that the detected pattern between the first field attribute and the second field attribute is preserved when the second panel is displayed to the user by the second computer system, and stores the converted field attributes in the second configuration table for use by the second computer system in displaying the second panel* (figures 4 and 6-8; par.33, 35-36, 38-39 and 42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Jung into Petty, this is true because Jung solves the problem of providing a user interface directed towards the conversion of data in a first type for a first panel (first application) into data of a second type for a second panel (second application) (Par.15). Petty solves a similar problem, providing a user interface directed towards the conversion of data in a first type (platform-specific user interface panels) into of a second type (platform-independent user interface panels). Thus it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to see the variant option of Jung to be a modification for Petty by providing additional functionality to solve a similar problem.

As for dependent claim 19, Petty teaches the computer program product of claim 18, further comprising instructions that when executed cause the processor to perform operations comprising: receiving and executing a command for editing the second panel (col.3, lines 25-33).

---

4. Claims 11-13, 16-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petty in view of Jung in further view of DevDaily.com (http://www.devdaily.com/java/edu/vc/vc010003/).

As for dependent claim 11, Petty as modified by Jung teaches the method of claim 10. Petty also teaches the use makes use of a graphical editor and mentions the use of Visual Café. Petty does not specifically go into details of how the graphical editor Visual Café works with user interaction, however in the same field of endeavor DevDaily.com teaches wherein the input is received and executed in a drag-and-drop environment (page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine DevDaily.com into Petty because DevDaily.com provide detailed user interaction with the system of Visual Cafe which was widely known in the art and for the fact that Petty mentions the use of Visual Cafe as a graphical editor for Petty's system of conversion (col.3, lines 5 and 30; Petty).

As for dependent claim 12, Petty as modified by Jung teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the input changes a location of one of the fields of the second panel (note the analysis of claim 11 above).

As for dependent claim 13, Petty as modified by Jung teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the input changes an attribute of one of the fields of the second panel (note the analysis of claim 11 above).

As for dependent claim 16, Petty as modified by Jung teaches the computer system of claim 14, wherein the conversion module provides a drag-and-drop environment for receiving and executing the command (note the analysis of claim 11 above).

As for dependent claim 17, Petty as modified by Jung teaches the computer system of claim 14, further comprising a drag-and-drop environment displayable on a screen by which a user can edit the second panel (note the analysis of claim 11 above).

As for dependent claim 20, Petty as modified by Jung teaches the computer program product of claim 19, further comprising instructions that when executed cause the processor to perform operations comprising: presenting a drag-and-drop environment where a user can edit the second panel (note the analysis of claim 11 above).

(Note :) **It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).**

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056 and fax is 571-270-2056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 9:30am- 5:00pm Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner
Art Unit 2179
September 9, 2009

/Ba Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179